



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/726,004

12/01/2003

Gerd Danner

34874-082/2003P00266US

5231

64280

7590

04/08/2009

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.  
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER  
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/08/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/726,004	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DANNER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SUSAN Y. CHEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Response to Amendment***

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on Dec. 19, 2008.

Claims 1-21, are pending for examination, claims 1 and 15 have been amended.  
Claims 22-23 have been canceled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1 and 15, it is unclear what does the claimed "a data abstraction layer" referred to, because the metes and bounds of the claimed "a data abstraction layer" is not defined by the instant application.

As to claim 2-14 and 16-21, these claims have the same defects as their base claims respectively, hence, are rejected for the same reason.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0208460 issued to Srikant et al. (hereinafter referred as Srikant) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,517 issued to Seibel et al. (hereinafter referred as Seibel).

Claim 1:

Srikant discloses a system for operational reporting of multidimensional analysis of business data sources [e.g., the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, the Distributed Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the system comprising:

one or more data sources providing OLTP data [e.g., the data warehouse at Section 0004, the source metadata and the OLAP data store at P. 1, Sections: 0009, the Distributed Teradata Warehouse, 0034-0035, the units: 420, 434 at Fig. 4 and associated texts];

a business intelligence (BI) platform having a multidimensional database providing OLAP data [e.g., P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052 & Fig. 4]; and

a mapping tool to transform the OLTP data of the data sources not being processed by an OLTP engine or the BI platform to a first data set in accordance with a common meta model of a unified view module [e.g., Sections: 0058 –0060, Fig. 6 and associated texts];

the unified view module being part of a data abstraction layer, the unified view module integrating the first data set of the OLTP data with the multidimensional database to produce a common meta model data set [e.g., Fig. 8 and associated texts]; and

a user interface (UI) tool set for creating a unified UI for displaying reports that are run on the multidimensional database and common meta model data set, the unified UI build reports from the common meta model data set e.g., the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Sections: 0031-0034],

Srikant did not specifically disclose the following:

the system including at least first and second data flow integration paths, the first path comprising the OLTP data and a mapping tool and having a first service quality; the second integration path comprising the BI platform and having a second services quality being different from the first service quality, the first service qualities being dependent on the service used by the first integration path, the second service qualities being dependent on the services used by the second integration path, and wherein the first and second service qualities are at least different in that the second service quality comprises at least some overhead of the BI platform which is not included in the first service quality.

However, Seibel discloses the claimed features [e.g., Abstract, the traversing of OLAP data element via the business intelligence paths such as “drill down” and “drill to detail” techniques at Fig(s). 5 – 8 and associated texts, wherein calls made in user session is quality controlled based on state law as shown in Fig(s). 8-12].

Srikant and Seibel are both of the same endeavor to facilitate the OLAP analysis of system resources in an Enterprise data Management (EDM) system by using data mining and mapping tools for merging Business intelligence (BI), hence, with the teachings of Srikant and Seibel in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made being motivated to use the scalable model-driven business logic as disclosed by Seibel, into Srikant’s system, because by doing so, the combined system will be upgraded to provide generic business intelligence data flow paths which facilitate a user of the system to navigate between related data sets that might not be obvious to a user and are therefor improve the OLAP analyzing qualities [e.g., Seibel: Sections: 0001-0008].

Claim 2:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the system comprising a UI runtime module to display the unified UI [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Sections: 0035-0036].

Claim 3:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the system comprising a data acquisition module to acquire the OLTP data from the OLTP data source, and to provide the OLTP data to the multidimensional database or to the unified view module [e.g., Srikant: P.3, Sections: 0031, 0036-37].

Claim 4:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the BI platform is to execute OLAP analysis on the multidimensional database [e.g., Srikant: P. 2, Section: 0015-0016 & Fig. 7].

Claim 5:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the BI platform further includes a communication channel connected to a remote OLAP data source [e.g., Srikant: the Internet at P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 6:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more resource adapters for connecting to the one or more data sources [e.g., Srikant: Fig. 7 & P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 7:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more extraction programs to read data from the one or more data sources [e.g., Srikant: the extract/link/load software of OLAP at P. 1, Section: 0005 & Fig. 8].

Claim 8:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the data acquisition module further includes an exchange infrastructure for message-based exchange between the one or more data sources and the BI platform [e.g., the Teradata Customer Analysis Product at P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 9:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the system comprising a mapping tool for mapping a data model of the one or more data sources to a common meta model for use by the unified view module [e.g., Srikant: P. 5, Section: 0059].

Claim 10:



In addition to the limitations recited in claim 9, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the mapping is automatic [e.g., Srikant: P. 2, Section: 0012].

Claim 11:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 9, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the mapping is manual [e.g., Srikant: P. 6, Section: 0071].

Claim 12:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the BI platform further comprises a persistency memory for storing one or more tables representing the OLAP analysis [e.g., Srikant: the unit 312, Fig. 3].

Claim 13:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the unified UI is generated by a web application [e.g., Srikant: the Web GUI at P.3, Section: 0035 & P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 14:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the unified UI is generated by a desktop application [e.g., Srikant: the Web GUI at P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 15:

Srikant discloses an architecture for integrating online transactional processing (OLTP) systems with online analytical processing (OLAP) system [e.g., Srikant: the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, Distributed Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the architecture comprising:

- a data access layer including one or more data access programs for accessing OLTP data from an OLTP data source [e.g., Srikant: Fig. 3];

- a service layer including a business intelligence (BI) platform for generating OLAP data, and a mapping tool for transforming data from the OLTP data source to a first data set in accordance with a common meta-model [e.g., Srikant: P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052, 0058 –0060 & Fig(s). 4 - 6 and associated texts];

- a unified view module being part of a data abstraction layer that provides the common meta-model for OLTP data of the first data set integrated with OLAP data [e.g., Srikant: Fig. 8 and associated texts]; and

- a user interface presentation layer configured to provide a user interface for displaying a report run on the integrated OLTP and OLAP data [e.g., Srikant: the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Sections: 0031-0034].

Srikant did not specifically disclose the following:

the architecture including at least first and second data flow integration paths, the first path comprising the OLTP data and a mapping tool and having a first service quality; the second integration path comprising the BI platform and having a second services quality being different from the first service quality, the first service qualities being dependent on the service used by the first integration path, the second service qualities being dependent on the services used by the second integration path, and wherein the first and second service qualities are at least different in that the second quality comprises at least some overhead of the BI platform which is not included in the first service quality.

However, Seibel discloses the claimed features [e.g., Abstract, the traversing of OLAP data element via the business intelligence paths such as “drill down” and “drill to detail” techniques at Fig(s). 5 – 8 and associated texts, wherein calls made in user session is quality controlled based on state law as shown in Fig(s). 8-12].

Srikant and Seibel are both of the same endeavor to facilitate the OLAP analysis of system resources in an Enterprise data Management (EDM) system by using metadata as mapping tools for merging Business intelligence (BI), hence, with the teachings of Srikant and Seibel in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made being motivated to use the scalable model-driven business logic as disclosed by Seibel, into Srikant's system, because by doing so, the combined system will be upgraded to provide generic business intelligence data flow paths which facilitate a user of the system to navigate

between related data sets that might not be obvious to a user and are therefor improve the OLAP analyzing qualities.

Claim 16:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 15, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the common meta-model is organized into a unified business query view for display in the user interface [e.g., Srikant: Fig. 2].

Claim 17:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 15, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a design time module for generating the user interface [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 18:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 17, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a runtime module having an application for displaying the user interface [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 19:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 18, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the application is a web application [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 20:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 18, the combined system of Srikant and Seibel further discloses the application is a desktop application [e.g., Srikant: P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 21:

The claimed limitations that " unified view module does not include information identifying sources of data in the common meta model data set such that a mapping of the data is not visible to a user of the common meta model data set" is the defaulted nature of unified view module.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments based on newly amended limitations filed on Dec. 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., provides various levels of real-time data through one integrated platform, while providing the same level of BI services and an identical "look and feel" to the end user

via the abstraction layer) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In addition, even if the arguments were recited in the claim, it read by the reporting linking system 800 as shown in Fig. 8, wherein, the system includes On-line Analytical Processing (OLAP) meta data software tools (e.g., 860) as the claimed abstract layer that deemed to take the business requirements, to produce a more details definition and analyses meta information for viewing or modification (i.e., “look and fell”) by a software developer to generate a customized report application [e.g., sections: 0028-0029]. Thus, in contrary to applicant's argument, the prior art on record clearly disclosed the claimed limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Harderle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,822) which disclosed a query system to identify the members related by multiple concepts or group hierarchies from an encoder.

***Points of Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN Y. CHEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susan Y Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2161

August 19, 2008

/Apu M Mofiz/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161